# *Comment on* Search for Muon Neutrino Oscillations with the Irvine-Michigan-Brookhaven Detector

J.M. LoSecco
*University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556-5670, USA*

L.R. Sulak
*Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, USA*

(Dated: January 27, 2016)

The neutrino flux used in Becker-Szendy *et al.*[2] is now known to be in error. Becker-Szendy *et al.*[2] depended heavily on the Lee and Koh flux[3] which was noted as erroneous in Gaisser *et al.*[6]. This makes the results of Becker-Szendy *et al.*[2] unreliable.

Keywords: neutrino anomaly, neutrino oscillations, atmospheric neutrinos

arXiv:1601.07152v1 [hep-ex] 26 Jan 2016

In an attempt to understand the atmospheric neutrino anomaly[1] we studied the higher energy upward going atmospheric muon neutrino flux by using upward through-going and upward stopping muons created by neutrino interactions in the rock surrounding the IMB detector[2]. Such an analysis depends strongly on the neutrino flux estimate since neither the interaction vertex nor the neutrino energy can be reconstructed. The fiducial mass depends on the neutrino energy and direction since higher energy muons will penetrate further through the rock. The work in [2] depended on the calculations of Lee and Koh[3] for the lower portion of the spectrum and Volkova[4] for the high energy part. This is risky since the overall error in the normalization of the flux estimate can be reduced with relative measurements of one portion of the flux to another portion. This may not happen when independent flux estimates are used for different energy regions. It has come to our attention[5] that [2] disagrees, in part, with current interpretations of the atmospheric neutrino anomaly as a result of neutrino oscillations.

Gaisser *at al.*[6] points out "We have discovered several bugs in the implementation of the LK code." in reference to [3] and drops it from consideration. Gaisser *at al.*[6] has an extensive discussion of how errors in the neutrino flux calculations will lead to errors in interpretation.

In light of the known error in [3] the results of [2] are unreliable. A contemporary article [7] compared the low energy Lee and Koh spectrum[3] with two other predictions, for both the Kamioka and IMB sites. The erroneous Lee and Koh spectrum consistently predicted lower neutrino event rates. Comparison of the Lee and Koh flux with modern estimates indicates it was low by more than a factor of two at modest energies. A later measurement of the upward stopping muon fraction[8] gave an observation consistent with Becker-Szendy *et al.*[2]. The more reliable flux estimates used in [8] predicted a stopping fraction which was $1.7\pm0.2$ times higher than observed.

In spite of these normalization problems Lee and Koh gave a consistent result of $1/2$ for the electron to muon neutrino flux ratio.

We would like to thank Olga Botner for bringing the issue of [2] to our attention. We would like to thank Bob Svoboda for help with the comparisons.

[1] T. J. Haines *et al.*, "Calculation of Atmospheric Neutrino-Induced Backgrounds in a Nucleon-Decay Search", Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 1986 (1986).
[2] R. Becker-Szendy *et al.*, "Search for Muon Neutrino Oscillations with the Irvine-Michigan-Brookhaven Detector", Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1013 (1992).
[3] H. Lee and Y. S. Koh, "A New Calculation of Atmospheric Neutrino Flux", Nuovo Cimento B 105, 883-887 (1990).
[4] L. V. Volkova, "Energy Spectra and Angular Distributions of Atmospheric Neutrinos", Yad. Fiz. 31, 1510 (1980) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 31, 784-790 (1980)].
[5] O. Botner (private communication).
[6] T. K. Gaisser, M. Honda, K. Kasahara, H. Lee, S. Midorikawa, V. Naumov, and Todor Stanev, "Comparison of Atmospheric Neutrino Flux Calculations at Low Energies", Phys. Rev. D 54, 5578 (1996).
[7] K. S. Hirata *et al.*, "Observation of a Small Atmospheric $\nu_\mu/\nu_e$ Ratio in Kamiokande". Phys. Lett. B280, 146 (1992).
[8] Y. Fukuda *et al.*, "Neutrino-induced upward stopping muons in Super-Kamiokande", Phys. Lett. B487, 185 (1999).